

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/930,449	10/07/97	ABE.	<b>!-!</b>	JA0-39512
			EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BE	RRIDGE	MMC2/1120	RAD.S	
PO BOX 199 ALEXANDRIA	28	en transferancia e la companya de l La companya de la co	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		a grand to be a significant	2814  DATE MAILED:	ng sa

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisom: Action	08/930,449	ABE ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Steven H. Rao	2814				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe						
THE REPLY FILED 10 October 2000 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicat ) a timely filed amendment which	tion. A proper reply to a places the application in				
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check only a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	n two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.	of the final rejection,				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amou the shortened statutory period for reply o ce later than three months after the maili	nt of the fee. The appropriate extension riginally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>10 October 2000</u> . A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon with requisite fees.	the timely submission of a Notice	e of Appeal and Appeal Brief				
3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);						
(c)   they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims.				
4. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):					
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a sep	parate, timely filed amendment				
6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		lered but does NOT place the				
7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly				
8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is	s as follows (see attached writter	explanation, if any):				
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-18,20-23,25-28,30-33,35-38,</u>	40-43,46-49 and 56-63.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
9.   The proposed drawing correction filed on a	)∐has_b)∐_has not been appro	oved by the Examiner.				
10. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
11. Other:						

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant presents the same arguments stated in the Amendment of entered Feburary 08, 2000 and the arguments were dealt with in Final rejection mailed Feb. 04, 2000 Further more Applicants in para 3 page 10 state the Office Action rejects claims 50-55. However the final rejection in question does not reject claims 50-55. Therefore the Examiner does not understand Applicants' contention. The present record is explicitly clear that claims 50-55. are withdrawn and were not rejected in the Final rejection mailed Feburary 08, 2000.

Sol m/17/2000

OLIK CHAUDHURI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800